

ES-2 Comments
Recommendation 15
Renewable energy incentives
(biomass, wind, solar, geothermal)

I downgraded this because it's a mish-mash. MT doesn't need to provide significant R&D funds--we're too small. Focus MT \$ on getting projects built here.

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

Government meddling/incentives rarely result in progress. Montana should be working to remove barriers to progress not impeding them by adding bureaucracy that adds no value to the end product. Furthermore, this report was based on a politically correct directive which assumes there is a man-made climate crisis. While this assumption has the backing of the media and politicians it has little support from the scientific community. Hence the reporting by the media of the relative minority that support the theory. Technology should be able to stand on its own merits without government incentives.

This is too far out to budget for. If the market does not support these things, then government should not until it becomes clear what is cost effective. Making new energy sources of all types suit proof would greatly help

Carbon offsets are nothing but smoke and mirrors. wh Trading on the markets could result in millions lost or made.

There should be a cost/benefit analysis required.

The benefits do not justify the costs using sound science. More taxes, regulations and red tape is not what will help Montana.

If it's such a great idea, why doesn't private industry invest without government money?

Private companies are exploring these issues, and I think government should stay out of it.

Further biofuel research and testing.

State funded research is unlikely to provide needed technological break throughs. Research should be funded by the private sector and the federal governemnt. State government should encourage efforts in this regard. State government should not be mandating or incenting transission line development. Any such requirements should come through the PSC review of utility resource plans.

I would have to be convinced that carbon markets work. Current news is that several persons may have paid for the same tree to be planted or that organizations cannot verify the carbon that has been offset. Could result in a feel good activity with no real benefit.

Need some potential diversified solutions for renewables and not only for wind.

I have done research at Texas A&M University.....if you believe these programs are efficient and represent good stewardship of the resources given to you then you just plain have not done your homework and that is sad given the power you have to legislate and the responsibility you are shirking.

WIND POWER!

There is a huge opportunity to encourage residential and business customers to purchase home alternative energy systems. We should allow consumers to sell alternative energy back to the grid. Sales should be at retail rates unless they exceed household annual electricity consumption. Households should be able to reduce their power bills to zero but not force utilities to pay above wholesale prices for energy.

Decentralized. I see a future with community substations producing their local energy. No need to spend millions on transmission lines. Keep it all local and keep citizens self sufficient. Then any excess beyond what Montana can use ship out of the state.

Keep it local, uncentralized so small farmers have a chance at being able to stay in their communities. Let small farmers/businesses bring back our Eastern Communities. Large incentives for corporations elbows out the little guy. We want more farmers.

I believe using Algae as an oil source for Biodiesel should be implemented. It would not only help take care of our energy problems but also TMDL problems for communities across the state. Algae thrives in wastewater streams and takes up nutrients.

Excellent. Government must lead in standards and research incentives. Provide funds that will, in effect, become seed money that will grow new industry and business, especially small, innovative - which is the backbone of Montana and our national economy.

Carbon market legislation is not a state issue.

highly favor renewable resources, but feel they should be made competitive on their own, without penalizing existing carbon markets

Let the market decide.

Let the free market produce these changes.

Is Montana's transmission system big enough to handle more wind?? Who's going to pay for the building of new transmission lines and substations? I think the first goal should be to find a energy source to firm up wind generation.

I work on a Hydrogen Fuel Cell project with Plug Power and MSU-Billings. Strongly favor forward thinking in these areas.

No carbon offsets!

If government merely gets out of the way, I think the market will take care of this issue. Start-ups with private equity will continue to move in this direction.

This is the reason I decided to fill out this survey. If we, as a state and as a country, can lead in these new technologies, we will continue to lead the world. We will be creating new, high skill jobs and industries and provide a service to the world in overcoming our dependence on non-renewable energy sources.

YES, YES, YES....

I generally support these but compressed air storage is inefficient and probably not a viable alternative.

I do not support large-scale industrial-style corporate wind farms and their accompanying transmission lines! Small distributed alternative energy systems, especially rooftop solar, have less impact on landscapes and provide plenty of jobs!

Concomitantly eliminate any subsidies for fossil fuel development, increase severance taxes for state fossil fuels (oil, gas, CBM, coal), and pressure the federal government to eliminate both direct subsidies and tax breaks for the oil industry.

Wind isn't the answer just a small part.

individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

Research & development, and a new program? Who pays for this, general fund, taxes?

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do it's job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive. Carbon credits are bullshit....smoke and mirrors.

Good!

Full bore support needed from government for this sane response to our energy crisis.

Disagree with carbon tax offsets.

Include development design standards to avoid impacts on birds and other wildlife, and minimize visual impacts.

There is now some question as to weather offsets are efficient.

Biomass should not come from public forests!

Biomass is a good options. However, wind and solar are limited. Wind generates kill birds and solar pollutes because the cooling ponds and battery backup necessary to collect the energy.

NO LEGISLATIVE MANDATES, ESPECIALLY INVOLVING CAPS ON CO2 PRODUCTION.

Montana is a prime location for wind development.

Based on recent studies which have quantified the beliefs of many opposed to current ethanol development in the US (that it creates more emissions in the manufacture than it saves in the burning), more effort should be put in to studying biofuels made from waste.

Following a national effort? Why not LEAD!!

Follow National cap-and-trade movement -- MT too small market to set its own standards. I see the natural offsetting technology for wind as solar and visa versa. Storing energy generating capacity in the form of compressed air just seems stupid (don't know enough about it though).

without legislation, the government should fund RESEARCH into alternative energy. use defense budget money for this.

I don't know that I buy into the whole "carbon market offset" idea. It seems to me that people would be buying offsets on lands that are already functioning as carbon offsets. It's a scam, in other words.

Is an incentive to one industry (renewables) gained by a fee or a tax on another (coal) simply to raise the cost on the cheaper so that the more expensive is competitive?

Most necessary technology already exists, but we always need more research.

Entirely too speculative. Sounds like something blowing in the wind.

Renewable resource efforts should not attempt to direct materials (e.g. wood products) away from value-added manufacturing to energy production without an equivalent increase in raw material availability.

Let private business do their own research

{No}Possible legislation on carbon markets including allowances and/or offsets, likely following a national effort

{No}Possible legislation on carbon markets including allowances and/or offsets, likely following a national effort.

YES! :)

again, sooner action!!

I strongly feel there is a clear need for innovative thinking.

Good idea.

Why is everyone so fixated on carbon markets-this is a giant added costs for energy.
why should the public pay twice for new technologies

Yes. Thirty years ago I urged the govs of MT.Wyo.ND.SD. & Nebraska to sponsor a worlds fair of wind energy. Where would we be now if they had? It never too late to do the right thing.
I can support this only if there are appropriate guidelines in place that account for the potential impacts on wildlife and habitat.

Carbon markets are a cop out. They avoid the issue. I won't even address the rest. Carbon markets are for people who put money above reality and solutions. There has been more than enough written to show that they actually hamper the needed changes.

Again, would give this a 5 but will not because of the possible legislation on carbon markets.

Make take more than one session to accomplish.

If the idea is to use the coal tax to make coal based generation more expensive and to use incentives to make wind,etc less expensive the bottom line is the end user could end up paying MUCH more. This has the potential to provide some benefits if handled properly.

Lets foster business development - great idea. The incentives apply only to for-profit business

This concept doesn't recognize the laws of physics.

Continuing to support growth of renewables is imperative to slow emissions of CO2. These are not get rich quick schemes, but require gov support, assistance, and often financial assistance to become economically feasible.

Funding for R&D should come from federal and private sources, not state income taxes or a state tax on energy.

There is not enough information with this proposal. There needs to be a cost analysis by credible sources done before any legislation is considered. Where to the R & D funds come from?

DOING RESEARCH AND OVERCOMING REGULATORY BARRIERS ARE DEFINITELY NEEDED. WHY JUST WIND? WHY NOT SMALL LOCAL HYDRO? EVEN SOLAR IN AREAS WHERE IT MIGHT DO SOME GOOD?

FORGET CARBON OFFSETS AND MARKETS. TOO MUCH OPPORTUNITY FOR FRAUD.

Long overdue.

Wind is a critical resource that Montana possesses a great deal of and needs to be better integrated into our states energy plan

Support proposed legislation listed here. Support incentives for wind, solar, and in some cases, geothermal. Do not support growing crops for energy production. Carbon markets can be a useful policy tool, but currently there is no consistent approach, so that needs to be worked out first.

If we must have allowances and/or offsets, we must (with reluctance).

Again, carbon offsets will not ultimately reduce carbon emissions. It simply moves them from one entity to another.

Let the market do its thing!!

Offsets again?? There seem to be good questions about the program.

R&D is crucial at this point in renewable energy development. There also needs to be a state entity that serves as a facilitator to various efforts. Cooperation also should be emphasised to increase implementation efforts. See "The diffusion of renewable energy technology: an analytical framework and key issues for research."

Stafan Jacobsson, Anna Johnson

This section is too broad! Wind and solar is fine!

Maybe geothermal. Biomass is a bad idea in my opinion. Support carbon markets if they are managed consistently.

No it will be more cost to us citizens

Why establish another governmental mandate when the federal legislation is also possible? Funding for research is good. Legislation requiring mandates is the wrong thing to do.

Alternate energy sources should be investigated, but should not be brought into play until they are cost effective on their own without government intervention. How can we increase biomass usage when it's politically incorrect to cut down a tree?

While it seems to be a proper government to plan appropriate development of transmission and towers, the rest of these mandates are proper functions of the free market.

These should take precedent over supposed clean coal technologies.

let the private market develop and implement these new technologies and resources over the course of natural supply-and-demand cycle

Wind power has not worked well in Oregon. How would this be different?

eliminate environmentalist and stop pushing keyota treaty

In other words, take money from the hard-working taxpayer by force and give it to some corporation. A strong focus on renewables is warranted.

The wind is always blowing somewhere in Montana. It is in our self-interest to firm it up.

Pursue grants for this research; do not pay for it with taxation.

Sounded good with research/development and incentives but lost me with the legislation. I think you should consider nuclear energy as a clean, now very safe, energy efficient alternative. Look at Europe (not eastern Europe).

Much of the technology is well-developed and already in use in other countries. The U.S. in general is far behind -- we need only look to these countries (such as Germany) and follow their example.

Forget the carbon markets crap.

Let the free market provide research and development funds for new technologies such as compressed air storage to balance wind..... Why siphon off money from the private sector, skim off bureaucratic salaries and then hand out up to 20% of the original taxes for this? Doesn't make sense to me.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.aspx>

"Appropriate development?" Nebulous and unworkable.

Wind power is one source, we cannot limit our abilities to wind alone which seems to be the big push. Wind is very unreliable and would not meet the needs of our communities. Wind is one source but we need a multitude of power sources to meet the demand.

The approach and goal is the same as ES-1. We cannot force our cooperatives to abide by the wishes of this recommendation without seeing a negative economic impact to the people of Montana. Use a carrot not a stick!

I ask one more time "Who will pay the incentives" Government has no money, only taxpayers to collect taxes from. We have more coal and oil and even nuclear reserves to serve us many years. We have people in the state who want to build clean power plants, but the Environmentalists block and stop each one. Every time an existing utility desires to upgrade they must spend millions on getting necessary approval, and if they are turned down, or lose to the Environmentalists in court they have lost their investment. Address that issue and we will have cleaner burning power plants producing cheap energy without pollution.

You mention Biomass, but there will be nothing coming off of federal land and the state seems powerless to influence the feds in any way. Taking up cropping systems and resources to turn into fuel is losing proposition. It costs more energy than is produced.

Zero legislation, especially on carbon markets. The first two items are good ones.

Why not just take the 100 mile per gallon carburetor out of mothballing and give it to the people? It already exists! Or, how about the technology that separates the Hydrogen molecule from the Oxygen molecules in water and give that to the people? Answer, if you care, because it's not enormously profitable and once it is out in the public it'll be difficult to manipulate and grow profits from.

Who pays??

Money from the tax payer again.

all good ideas as long as it is not mandatory and cost prohibitive.

As technology becomes available these things are happening as long as the market will support it. Legislation should be the last resort.

Wind energy can be self supporting and should not rely upon taxpayers to line the pockets of investors and speculators

As long as we all suffer the same costs (that means low income)

I like incentives to help people research renewable energy and better determine their overall benefit to society.

This could be useful, but ...we as a society don't yet have the understanding of how to do it. Until we have a clear picture of what we are doing ~ and what kind of a difference it will make worldwide ~ we can't be making policy about it! (We do need to insist the federal government work more with foreign countries on this issue...places like China and India present a much more complex problem than anything we in Montana are doing. But the governor CAN have a huge impact by calling for worldwide education and reduction.

The issue will be the ability to 'firm' any renewable resource. Firming will drive the cost of renewables

Lets subsidize more inefficient energy sources. Try making energy affordable for people.

Would support if it is restricted to our government offices/buildings.

BS. R&D funds means tax payer \$\$\$ amrket will be a better driver.

As in above. Incentives will spur investment in the wrong technologies.

R & D at the university level needs to have strict oversight!

This should also include pumped storage units, and should include clean coal production as we have a huge coal resource here in Montana.

All of the above so important.

Biomass should not mean corn.

This recommendation should be sincerely EMPHASIZED, because it is sustainable. Twenty years down the road, we'll consider it a swell decision from both an energy supply standpoint and an environmental view.

Build Nuclear Plants, no carbon and reliable power at high enough levels to be a feasible solution to thermal issues. Wind power is not. Must be backed up by some source of power.

The governments job is to help break through the barriers and roadblocks to intelligent and thoughtful progress that leads to long term stability and controlled growth.

What about Hydro Power? That is more reliable than what has already been mentioned.

I've lived on the front. We've got the wind. Let's actually use it for something positive.

Legislation that includes carbon markets would have productive potential if the market solution is combined with a carbon tax and with conservation (a.k.a., efficiency). But Montana will be at risk if all its eggs are put in any one basket.

raises taxes and tax breaks for the rich

Because the price of wind, at this point in time, is higher than that of fossil fuels, we must find incentives for individuals, industries, utilities, etc., to invest in wind power and other renewable energy sources. The state should provide financial incentives-subsidies, tax breaks-and should provide a structure in which it is easy to build renewable plants and IMPOSSIBLE to build fossil fueled plants.

Biomass should be viewed skeptically.

Important to integrate solar into the grid.

Let the market determine what sources the utilities use. We should use cost effective solutions not government mandated ones

Incentives AND direct investment.

The companies who do this talk a better game than a used car salesman and deliver even bigger lemons after taking your money. No thanks. The wind simply does not work as a reliable power source.

I highly support this plan with the exception of carbon market offsets and allowances

Not reliable sources, cost too much to build for what they produce.

The positive aspects of this proposal are the "providing funds" ideas and "following Fed lead". The state should not march off on its own on this. We are not here to "save the world".

Why are we trying to reinvent what is already being done. We need to get competent professionals into this, why not the best who are successful at it?

If you make it available and support it, people will do it. We have a great potential here, let's make a difference.

This is big.

This should be addressed by the private sector. The government doesn't have to be the answer to all the problems.

Legislation (Congress) to do away with the Equal "Access to Justice" provisions that allow eco-groups to stop most timber utilization projects proposed by federal agencies.

Let the market work and rely on private investors for those projects that are economically sound.

Wind is an ugly energy source and carbon offsets are a joke.

We had the will and are fortunate to have been able to have the funds for both a 10kw wind generator and the EV.

Instead of legislating this, let private companies do it.

Taxpayer expense

How would this be paid for?

Great except for carbon offsets

I disagree with the compressed air storage idea, might make these things costly. Can agree with everything else!!

Will increase costs to consumers. Alternative energies should be able to be competitive without government subsidies.

I do not agree with carbon trading - it is a hoax! We need to clean up dirty (high CO2 producing plants) and not build new ones! Go renewable energy solar/wind.

yes, incentive the market.

What chance do you have if the environmentalists won't allow a wind farm north of Glasgow. Without government subsidies, wind power is less efficient and more costly than what we do now.

This recommendation will likely lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Montana's potential hydroelectric market may equal its existing fossil fuel market in terms of scope and magnitude. It is essential that the research, development, legislation, and funding be put in place to expand the state's woefully underdeveloped market for wind power.

Montana has too much potential in the area of renewable energy to let other states become industry leaders and leave us behind. If we want to continue to be looked to as forward thinkers in rational and restrained government letting the market do most of the work is a prudent choice.

Again, a program that could lead to "possible legislation" to be another step into the lives of the average citizen to control their average day.

Eliminate the carbon markets and this is more attractive.

Biomass use is/will be very important.

This is not a function of the State. It should be left for the private sector.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls**t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

Compressed air storage???

Wind energy facility siting should be carefully evaluated with respect to impacts of plant and animal populations.

Should be optional only. No more mandated legislation or requirements.

Oh yeah! The government is soooooo efficient. Surely they will save us.

Man-Made Global Warming Agenda is a FRAUD. Go read the peer-reviewed scientific studies on this.

Wind does not always blow. Maybe the wind blows all the time in congress but not always in the real world.

That's fine in a free market, not in a government controlled market.

More windmills

who pays for this

There is a question mark over these renewable energy sources as the inherent cost of producing them has not been analysed using all the cost factors of producing them.

see above. allowing only the financially able to contribute more pollution to the earth is not acceptable.

MT has a great source of wind energy, also moving water and land for development of biomass.

Why is no one looking into small scale hydro-electric. There are some sites in the west, like gravity feed irrigation projects that could have hydro units incorporated without much environmental impact.

But must also look into environmental costs associated with these.

If you ban new fossil fuel plants and tax existing ones the new plants will be renewable energy plants. On the other hand there should be a serious look at the potential of geothermal which, if built, should be publicly owned.

Cut out the carbon markets and I agree with you. We do not need to fatten the wallets of others for mythical carbon offsets. If you send me enough money, I will live off the grid myself, and find some friends to follow suite. I will also plant all the trees you want. We can keep the money in Montana. That would keep carbon emissions down.

Needs strong emphasis.

Why not encourage on-site power generation and begin to wean MT from the inefficient, unsightly, resource intensive and voltage losing power transmission lines.

This is a good incentive.

How about researching solutions that are cheaper than burning coal or hydroelectric dams?

I prefer incentives to requirements.

I think we should model states that have higher standards than the Feds.

In addition to maximizing energy production at the existing hydroelectric facilities we have in Montana, the state should explore the potential for power generation at existing dams which have no electrical generating capabilities such as Tongue River dam. Also, in addition to investigating the use of compressed air for energy storage some research should be dedicated to study the feasibility of using water storage for the same purpose. Wind, solar or off-peak power could be dedicated to pumping water from a stream, river or even a lake to a off-stream reservoir which would then be released at a rate more consistent with demand. An additional benefit might be buffering the effects of seasonal low flows. This same concept might be applicable to existing dams resulting in an increase in the overall electrical generating output.

These methods of generating electricity are clean and should be encouraged with financial support. To be able to integrate wind power into the energy grid should be top priority.

How are you going to pay for this?

Many Montana citizens are concerned that they will have to make sacrifices of land to accomodate wind and coal generation that will primarily serve out of state interests. If wind generation cannot afford to follow existing laws and make the investments it needs in transmission, one questions how economically viable wind energy really is. Similarly, so called clean coal for out of state markets should be able to afford to invest in its own CO2 pipelines and transmission lines without public subsidies. If either cannot afford to pay thier own way to supply out of state markets, then they probably do not compete well with other sources closer to out of state markets that will have lower environmental and economic costs.

Yessssssssss!!!!!!!

I like coal.

See to it that Montanans benefit from all the wind potential in this state..ie. lowere energy bills.

Very important!!!!

Carbon credits are a scam. Small wind turbines on every house is a better more cost effective idea. No more legislation! Is this a soverin nation or a puppet of the Uninted nations.

The first item re is so far out of limits, I must say no to the others

The private companies involved in these technologies should address this. The government doesn't have to be the answer to all the problems.

Are these goals achievable? Who will pick up costs for R&D?

Do away with the carbon credits. How inane.

General comment to survey: I do not like the word "require" to appear in any of the suggestions within this survey here. 2nd comment: Wind will never meet 25% of our demand. Plus there are issues already with flyways and death to birds. However, along the Front, wind is definitely there and should be utilized when not in the center of a significant flyway.

Our state has a lot of oppportunity to furthur develop wind power. Let's do it.

This recommendation will likely lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Lets get more hydroelectric dams going. It's the only truly green power plants.

Carbon markets are just a skim-off for Wall Steet pukes. And Al Gore.Do not artificially support wind. The timing of wind often does NOT match demand, meaning a base-load infrastructure must be kept on stand-by.

No to carbon offsets! Too little too late and they still allow the worst polluters to continue to pollute.

The governor's promotion of next generation coal development and use, needs to be carried out. Oil ought to be developed with sound practices, and not pilloried as the current trend tends to be. We (U.S.) can be energy independent, and through reasonable measures.

I don't believe the State of Montana should pour any money into R & D. Private enterprise is already investing in this and government should not step into it.

Government imposing these mandates would be ineffiecient and they are unnecessary.

Industrial wind sites, placed in the wrong location could have significant impacts on Montana. A comprehensive wind program should include incentives for siting to minimize impacts to wildlife. let the market sort this out... Remove any existing regulations on use and development of renewable energy

AGAIN, MAKE the COOP's be part of this. The Elect COOPS do not want RE

Why isn't hydropower considered renewable? It doesn't burn anything, and it doesn't take water out of the system, just harnesses the energy of water flowing in-stream.

Again, make allowances for solar technology as well

We are wasting large amounts of biomass every year with forest fires. Lack of ability for the Forest Service to manage the fuel load on the Federally managed public lands in Montana has convinced me that the State of Montana should create legislation to correct this problem. Mercury now found in many lakes is undoubtedly coming from the catastrophic fires. Science shows that forest fires are the number one contributor to the release of airborne mercury. Fire fighting costs have soared. Private property is at risk with no assumed liability from the Forest Service as the sole federal land manager. DNRC has proposed forcing counties to enact regulation in Wildland Urban Interface areas to control house building materials and landscaping. Greater cost to consumer and less affordable housing. Federally managed public land in Montana must be required to use "Best Management Practices". Why should they be any different from many of the Zoning regulations that Montana has adopted.

Yes to R&D. Yes to addressing increased ability of the grid to take the lower cost large scale wind. No to forced subsidized integration of small (High cost) wind into the grid. The operation impacts are high including very real safety considertions and operational aspecdts that affect all consumers. Let Fed do any carbon action as it is a national and international issue.

Why do you combine wind and carbon in the same comment?

Allowing individual citizens to create thier own wind energy has incredible benefits. Wind towers would then not take up open space, or be within prime wildlife habitat. It allows citizens to take control of thier energy.

Increase transmission capacities first the work on other sources of power. Whats carbon got to do with this?

The state should not subsidise or otherwise provide incentives to the private sector. This has a market-distorting effect and by favouring existing technologies, this policy would delay the onset of new technologies.

Let the market dictate, not the Government.

Following the national and/or adopting other state's approaches would seem to be the most efficient method. Montana may be too small an entity to do these R&D functions. Why duplicate other efforts?

Include incentives for research on ground source heat/cooling pumps.

The broad picture using renewables on smaller, localized scale puts the power, literally, back in the hands of the people and allows everyone to become more conscious of where their energy comes from and that it is a unique privilege to use energy the way we do in this country.

Provide more information on compressed air storage combined with wind development

HOW ABOUT LEGISLATION TO "LIMIT" ENVIRO GROUPS FROM MESSING WITH SITE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE FACILITIES???

Objection to carbon offsets.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

too expensive

YES YES YES YES

R&D funding is okay. Get some knowledgeable people on task forces regarding renewables development. The podium is being filled by loud voices with little knowledge of long term feasibility and costs.

How do we pay for these programs? R & D are very expensive. While I understand offering some assistance to encourage these activities, we can't afford to pay for it all with our tax dollars.

providing biomass does not come out of food stock production. source of biomass should be perennial and come from marginal lands, perhaps those now under the CRP (except those lands that have wildlife implications)

there is climate change. But mans impact is limited. Maybe as little as less than 3-5% need cost benefit analysis

Make sure you capture all the wind and hot air that comes out of the governors office on a daily basis.

Use gov't funds to improve the infrastructure

A lot of funds need to be directed to the development of these renewable energy sources.

he State should consider expanding the availability of incentives to businesses that invest in renewable energy sources and use the energy generated on-site. Also, any carbon offset or energy credit potentially generated within a state scheme should be capable with a national market.

Please see attached or sent document to Senator Lugar from William Dittl

stay out of the national effort. we have low wages let the Federal government lead. also wind is only about 25% efficient. I'm telling you we need the work from coal development in this state. Quit the pipe dream of "Californicating" Montana. Lets go on clean coal

Forget carbon offsets. That gives corporations too much leway to find ways to cheat.

likely very expensive

I'm in favor of developing energy sources as close to the point of use as possible to reduce loss in transport.

Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.

Sure lets build a huge ballon to store compressed air we can let it out a little at a time to power the windfarms, how do we get it in there. Costs more energy to store it than we get back, we can build more windmills to store air. Need more transmission lines, great do away with environmental impact studies, seize right of ways, seize the land for the windfarm after all only the government knows best.

Lowering barriers will increase renewable energy projects.

All work here and elsewhere in this document should include lifecycle accounting of carbon emissions.